



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of transportation; but the relief granted cannot be based upon the contract or a breach thereof, but as a substituted medium of payment. *L. & N. R. R. Co. v. Crowe* (Ky.), 160 S. W. 759. See NOTES, p. 561.

CONTRACTS—VALIDITY—CUSTODY OF CHILD.—A divorcee entered into a contract with her father-in-law whereby she turned over the custody and control of her child to him in consideration whereof he agreed to care for and educate the child and to pay to the mother during her life a sum of money in the nature of an annuity sufficient to support her. *Held*, the contract is not void as against public policy and the mother can recover her arrears of annuity. *Clark v. Clark* (Md.), 89 Atl. 405.

An agreement whereby a parent divests himself of the custody and control of his child is generally held void as against public policy. *People v. Mercein*, 3 Hill (N. Y.) 399, 38 Am. Dec. 644; *Weir v. Marley*, 99 Mo. 484, 6 L. R. A. 672; SPENCER, DOM. REL., 436. But this rule is subject to the qualification that the welfare of the child is of primary importance. *Bonnett v. Bonnett*, 61 Ia. 198, 47 Am. Rep. 810; *Carpenter v. Carpenter*, 149 Mich. 138, 112 N. W. 748; *State v. Porter*, 78 Neb. 811, 112 N. W. 286. Unless such contract is contrary to some constitution or statute, the only public policy it could contravene is sound policy and good morals. *Trist v. Child*, 21 Wall. (U. S.) 441; *McCowen v. Pew*, 153 Cal. 735, 96 Pac. 893. Where the contract is between members of the same family, as in the principal case, and is beneficial to the child as well as to the parent, it is difficult to see how it could be contrary to any rule of policy or code of morals. On the contrary, sound policy and good morals should demand the upholding of such contract whereby both the parties in interest and the state are benefited. Such contracts are not void as against public policy; and, being valid, are enforceable *in solido*. *Enders v. Enders*, 164 Pa. St. 266, 30 Atl. 129, 44 Am. St. Rep. 598, 27 L. R. A. 56; *Crisholm v. Chisholm*, 40 Can. Sup. Ct. 115, 11 A. & E. Ann. Cas. 213.

CRIMINAL LAW—VENUE—BRINGING STOLEN PROPERTY INTO A STATE.—The defendant was charged with stealing property in one state and bringing it into another. *Held*, he is guilty of larceny in the latter state. *Hobbs v. Commonwealth* (Ky.), 162 S. W. 104.

It seems settled that a person stealing an article in one county and bringing it into another in the same state may be convicted of larceny in the latter county. By a legal fiction of the common law each moment's retention is considered as a fresh asportation. *Commonwealth v. Cousins*, 2 Leigh (Va.) 708; *Commonwealth v. Hayes*, 140 Mass. 366, 5 N. E. 264. A number of the states have statutes declaratory of the common law rule. *Kidd v. State*, 83 Ala. 58, 3 So. 442; *Green v. State*, 114 Ga. 918, 41 S. E. 55. But when the crime is a compound larceny such as burglary it cannot be tried in the latter county because all of the necessary elements are not present. *Gage v. State*, 22 Tex. Crim. App. 123, 2 S. W. 638.

When larceny is committed and the stolen property is taken into another state a more difficult question arises and one on which the au-